

States will continue to stand by its close ally to ensure that fairness is not sacrificed in the interest of expediency. For it is not just the rights of the Greek Cypriot community that are at stake, but the viability of the human and civil rights that all democracies—that most enduring of Hellenic institutions—hold most dear.

IDAHOANS SPEAK OUT ON HIGH ENERGY PRICES

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, in mid-June, I asked Idahoans to share with me how high energy prices are affecting their lives, and they responded by the hundreds. The stories, numbering over 1,000, are heartbreaking and touching. To respect their efforts, I am submitting every e-mail sent to me through energy_prices@crapo.senate.gov to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is not an issue that will be easily resolved, but it is one that deserves immediate and serious attention, and Idahoans deserve to be heard. Their stories not only detail their struggles to meet everyday expenses, but also have suggestions and recommendations as to what Congress can do now to tackle this problem and find solutions that last beyond today. I ask unanimous consent to have today's letters printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thanks for the info. And thanks for asking for input. My family is seeing the pinch somewhat. We live 20 miles from Boise, and since work and shopping are in Boise, that puts us on the road a lot during the week. We have been forced to consolidate trips, which is not that bad an idea. We also drive our little car (Honda Civic) more, which, for a family of large people such as ours, is not a small problem. We do not drive my pick-up as much as we have in the past, either.

I think that it is about time we developed our own resources regardless of the impact of individual families. It is a strategic decision since the world's oil reserves are being used at an ever-increasing rate because of the growth of the economies of different countries around the world. The U.S. is not the only consumer any more, and we have to live with that. So, drilling in ANWR, off the coast and developing oil shale is a good thing, especially since we have proven that we can do it with very little impact on the environment (as is the case of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline). Of course, we can expect accidents, but we have to deal with that if it happens and engineer a plan for that contingency to prevent it from happening.

I think solar power is something we really have to look at. Why not require that every new house built have solar collectors on the roof. This will do a number of things:

It will create a new industry which will create a fertile environment for R&D, which will, in turn, improve the efficiency and branch into new areas where solar power can be used that have not been considered yet.

It will use a resource that is not being utilized because of inefficiency. But, regardless of how inefficient our use is, if we do not use it, it is going to waste, anyway.

It will open a new realm of thought where American ingenuity can take over branching into other areas.

If we could offer tax or other types of incentives to home owners who choose to retrofit their existing houses to solar power, we could further increase the possibility of development of the use of the resource.

I think nuclear energy has proven itself to be a great source of power. Its increased use would foster research into uses of the spent fuel, which seems to me to be the most controversial area. Again, I am sure that with the increased use of nuclear power comes the increased possibility of accidents, but also comes the increased knowledge base from which to work, keeping the possibilities of accidents to a minimum.

One of the important questions I would like to raise is the viability of ethanol. I think it is going to do too much damage (we are seeing it already) to our food-producing industry. It is already causing an increase in food costs in the grocery store, and further development will cause, I am afraid, an even larger cost increase. We are already importing foodstuffs from other countries, something we have not had to do before.

UNSIGNED.

You write that my country is too dependent on foreign oil and we must develop alternate energy sources. You, your party, and many of the Democrats have voted consistently against all such alternatives for one reason or another. [I disagree with your assessment of the problem.] It is of no use to write about my experience with the rise in gas prices. If Congress and this Administration need stories, then it further proves that our elected government [is not responsive to its citizens][Congress has] held hearings with the oil representatives, which [has not resulted in anything.] Thank you for your inattention to this response.

HARRY.

I am a small business owner in Meridian. I will put this succinctly: My government is allowing OPEC to put me and other businesses out of business! If I understand this correctly, we import most of our oil from Canada and Mexico. If I also understand this correctly, they import a lot of food and technology from us. Therefore, if we get little to no oil, then understandably, they should get no food or technology and keep [their own] citizens in [their] country. I cannot afford to pay higher taxes for these illegal people. No oil = no food. I can live longer without their oil than they can without our food. Stop all Alaskan pipeline oil to Japan; why should we be in critical shortage and continue to supply them?

We can build refineries, too. Obviously the OPEC cartel does not want to since they are raping our bank accounts with the few that are working. Drill off-shore; China is [doing so] in our own gulf, and drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

[I am tired of all the talk without any action. Congress must get this country moving in a positive direction.]

Support the troops.

Secure the border.

Drill and process our own oil, build refineries.

Secure English as our language.

No foreign aid to countries hostile to the U.S.

Practice some ethics in government service.

[I am very unhappy with the inaction of Congress on this matter.]

Sincerely,

DAVID, *Meridian*.

DEAR SENATOR CRAPO: I received your e-mail and just wanted to respond in kind to it.

I also heard President Bush's speech this morning that he would like to lift the ban on

offshore drilling, begin shale drilling in Wyoming, Colorado and Utah, and also begin drilling in ANWR. My husband and I are 100 percent in favor of this happening, and hope that your vote will likewise be the same in the Senate. What a shame that this country has not built a new refinery in thirty years. It is hard to believe that we have let ourselves become so dependent on foreign oil, and it is a disgrace to this country. We would also be in favor of nuclear energy, and affordable hybrid cars (electric and gas) to lessen the dependency on oil.

My husband and I are both retired and on fixed incomes so the sky rocketing fuel prices affecting the cost of food, and anything else shipped by truck, has not only cut into our income, but also into our savings.

We thank you for all the good work you are doing on our behalf as Senator of Idaho. Please keep up the fight so that our voices can be heard.

Sincerely,

SHEILA.

It is time that we must remind Republicans that if we do not drill, we will no longer be the strongest nation in the world. I am sure that the Liberals and Environmentalists want us to suffer. We are a "can do" nation and we can start drilling off the coasts and in ANWR. We need to show, the Americans, that we are still a "can do" nation. Maybe we should tell all those who do not support drilling that we should not support them in Congress. We are a nation that has always had a "can do" attitude. We do not [want people in Congress who do not support drilling and new jobs; we need people who will allow us to develop our own resources without reliance on foreign countries.] We have plenty of oil and oil shale in our country to start drilling now.

MARY.

Good for you, Senator Crapo!! Thank you for not falling for the illogical environmental hysteria that is taking over the political landscape right now. We need long-term planning, not short-term panic.

MARV.

I have presently read a report written by a retired engineer from Exxon. This engineer has proposed a change from oil to coal-oil. That can be produced at \$40 a barrel and within EPA standards. To me, this is a no-brainer for the interim until a permanent solution is available.

HERBERT.

My wife and I live in Hailey and are octogenarians, so the impact of high energy costs is felt through home heating and cooking and limitation on driving. Perhaps the greatest impact is the rising cost of food and services relating to costs of energy. We have canceled out two vacations this summer and fall, and go into town to shop and pick up mail just 2 or 3 days a week.

If Congress actually gets serious, I feel we would be well served by 1) offshore drilling and new refining and 2) a serious long-term effort to diversify into nuclear power, and other economically correct alternatives, including coal and shale oil.

Keep your eye on the ball.

JIM AND MARTY.

"This year alone, the average American family will spend more than \$200 a month on gasoline."

YOU are now paying about half what Europeans pay for gas—so this is what you chose to call a "crisis." But then of course you do not walk in my shoes. The Europeans apparently have learned to live with outrageous

gas prices, but then their governments do not provide tax incentives for people to buy SUVs and 1-ton trucks to go shopping in. Maybe there is no SUV or 1-ton truck lobby over there.

Here is MY crisis—if you are interested: I am paying \$1,293 per month for medical insurance for my wife and myself. That is a heck of a lot more than your \$200 “crisis.” That takes care of about all of my company pension (after 30 years of employment).

For that \$200 in gas I can escape to McCall or Stanley for a weekend. That \$1,293 medical insurance does not even offer me peace of mind, as I struggle each month to justify the payment.

Obviously—your crisis is not my crisis—and vice versa.

OLE, Boise.

This fuel problem is, of course, hard on us all. But the young families trying to make ends meet by working two jobs and still cannot meet the student's needs, and cannot get any to help because they do not fall into the right bracket to receive stamps or whatever, free children's lunches, even. The real people are the ones who are hurting. Yes, something has got to give. Bless you for caring.

MARY.

The bottom line solution to our energy crisis is to dramatically reduce our dependence on fossil fuel as quickly as possible, especially foreign oil. Sooner or later that supply is going to be history.

The big question is what can we do now? I can think of several ideas: (1) Allow oil drilling in the U.S. in those areas currently restricted by environmental law. (2) Create monetary incentives for auto manufacturers who offer non-fossil fuel vehicles for sale and also incentives for those who buy them. (3) Encourage the use of nuclear energy to generate electrical energy, both for home and domestic use. (4) To help pay for some of this, apply a healthy surcharge on every gallon of foreign oil that comes into the U.S. And finally (5) continue to help educate our U.S. public in new and better ways to cope with high energy costs.

None of this will come quick or easy, but something has to be done now to keep from destroying our U.S. economy and existence.

Thank you.

DAVE AND HELEN, Meridian.

I totally disagree with your statement in the first paragraph that reads:

“The driving distances between places in our state as well as limited public transportation options mean that many of us do not have any choice but to keep driving and paying those ever-increasing prices for fuel. The United States is too dependent on petroleum for our energy. And we are far too dependent on foreign sources of that petroleum. We urgently need to expand our own domestic production of petroleum and need to significantly diversify our energy sources.”

More emphasis should be placed by Congress (including you) on forcing the three domestic automobile manufacturers to increase the mileage cars and trucks get and phase out production of gas-guzzling SUVs, while increasing the production levels of hybrid cars similar to the ones Toyota and Honda make. Instead of coming up with new ideas you advocate continuing the status quo, which is to allow auto manufacturers to save money on the research necessary to come up with cars that have leading-edge technology, like the Toyota Prius. No wonder American car makers are losing billions of dollars and are now behind Toyota in cars sold. Next thing we taxpayers will probably have to do is to bail these companies out, just as we did with Chrysler in the early 1980s.

ROBERT, Boise.

DEAR SENATOR CRAPO, While there is no short term fix for escalating energy prices, I believe there are a few things that we can do to ensure the United States of America will have viable energy for the future.

(1) Speculative Impact on Oil—Taxing the oil companies into oblivion is not the answer, but the methods that are used to trade oil contracts can be changed. Since oil speculators only need to put 4 percent—7 percent down on an oil contract, there are too many speculators in the market that have no intention of ever taking delivery of a drop of oil. Raising the down payment to be comparable to the stock market (50 percent down payment) will take out the investors “dabbling” in oil. Let us do the math on this: If I took \$40,000 of my own money, I could buy one million dollars worth of oil contracts that I would have no intention of ever taking delivery of. Removing oil contracts such as these from the market would give us a better idea of true supply/demand ratio really is.

(1a) The Fed needs to do what is necessary to increase the value of the dollar. A stronger dollar slows down speculative buying of oil, causing the price to drop.

(2) Import tariff on ethanol. While we do not want to be dependent on yet another imported fuel, this would remove some of the pressure on food prices due to demand for corn. Corn is so important to our society that most people do not grasp the impact it has on many areas of the economy. Everything from carbonated drinks, dog food, meat, etc. depend on corn in one way or another and also raises the prices for other crops because less of these other crops are being planted in favor of corn. Now take that price increase, and add the effect of the flooding this year and we are looking at a recipe for rampant inflation. Since Idaho farmers produce a large amount of sugar from sugar beets, maybe helping them build some plants to turn that sugar into ethanol is a viable option.

(3) Other energy sources. We cannot continue to count on oil as our primary source for energy. The Federal Government has known for years that we can get biodiesel from ALGAE! (<http://www.unh.edu/p2/biodiesel/article%20alge.html> cites many government sources) We cannot afford to not provide funds for more research and development in this field. Clean nuclear energy—we need to do whatever we can to be able to take spent nuclear fuel and regenerate it, thus having less nuclear waste going into the ground. If the French can do this, there should be nothing in our way to prevent us for doing it—even if it means renegotiating nuclear proliferation treaties. We also need to invest more into research and development of solar and wind power. We also need to overturn drilling bans that are in place in places such as the coasts of California and Florida. We also cannot deny that this country needs more refining capacity, and we need to come up with a way to help companies cut the red tape and build more refinery capacity.

(4) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REGULATION—The rules imposed by the EPA have impacted our ability to have higher mile per gallon vehicles. Tighter emission laws always results in a decrease in fuel economy. If engines put out less emissions in emissions tests, is that negated by them consuming more fuel over several years? For example, the change from low sulfur diesel (500 ppm sulfur) to Ultra low sulfur diesel (50 ppm) caused diesels to lose about 2 percent economy and some of the older engines have problems with the new diesel eating through seals. Having regulations more like Europe (separate policies for gasoline engines vs. diesel engines) would also help. Due to the current EPA regulation, nobody can import

the clean diesels from Europe such as the Volkswagen Polo—which with the diesel engine gets 72 mpg. Hybrid vehicles cannot touch this kind of fuel economy. Just think how many gallons of fuel would be saved by cars like this, then think about how many more gallons of fuel would be saved if this vehicle used biodiesel!

As for how it affects my life: I had already reduced my driving after diesel hit \$3/gallon, and now I have reduced it even more. I canceled plans to visit family in North Idaho for the Memorial Day Weekend (I live in Boise), and about the only driving I do is to/from work (5 miles each way), and necessary errands such as the grocery store. I also end up hunting much less than I would like, and if the price continues to climb, I may not hunt at all. If more people like me do not hunt, then the Idaho Fish and Game department will have huge funding shortfalls which, in my opinion, jeopardizes the future of wildlife conservation in our state. I also have cut down on spending of all other types, whether it is eating out or not buying consumer goods.

There is not an instant solution to the energy crisis, but some of the things above will help in the short term. We need to focus on the long term energy policy not only to cause prices to normalize, but to prevent economy-killing price hikes like we are seeing now.

ALAN, Boise.

We are 70 years old and active seniors on a fixed income. Energy costs are becoming a burden for us and will begin to go into our reserves for future years. Gas prices are obviously a problem but the cost of groceries is also a big item. We have one car and my husband rides a bicycle as much as possible. I walk to places when destinations are close enough. We are concerned about being good stewards of our environment and do what we can, e.g., recycling, using less gas, using fans instead of an air conditioner when practical, raising some of our own food, planting trees on our property, and conserving water.

We are disgusted that we are the victims of bogus global warming fanatics, environmentalists, and opportunists. Ethanol, which has not been proven to be efficient or good for engines, is using up corn that was used for food and livestock feed thus raising food costs. We have oil reserves in our own soil that could be used. There are other countries drilling off our shores so why cannot we since this would not create any more risk than is already present?

ALLEN AND JANE, Nampa.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHURCHS FERRY, NORTH DAKOTA

• Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am pleased to honor a community in North Dakota that recently celebrated its 125th anniversary. On June 27 through June 29, the residents of Churchs Ferry celebrated their community's history and founding.

This Great Northern Rail Road town site was founded in 1886 and named for the ferry service operated by Irvine A. Church. Mr. Church moved his Church post office to the town on November 13, 1886, adopting the new name. To conform to new government spelling regulations the name was changed to Churchs Ferry on November 30, 1894.

Although its population is small, Churchs Ferry serves as a testament to